



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,841	04/29/2006	Gordan Iain Campbell	X-15830	6066
25885 7590 03/05/2008 ELI LILLY & COMPANY PATENT DIVISION P.O. BOX 6288 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46206-6288				
EXAMINER ANDERSON, REBECCA L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1626				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/05/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@lilly.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/577,841

Applicant(s)

CAMPBELL ET AL.

Examiner

REBECCA L. ANDERSON

Art Unit

1626

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-22 and 35-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 18-22 and 35-37 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 38-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/29/06

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 18-22 and 35-40 are currently pending in the instant application. Claims 18-22 and 35-37 appear allowable. Claims 38-40 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the slowing or interrupting the progression of depression does not reasonably provide enablement for all treatment, including prophylactic treatment, of depression. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

As stated in the MPEP 2164.01 (a), "There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue."

In *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have need described. They are:

1. the nature of the invention,
2. the state of the prior art,

Art Unit: 1626

3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the amount of direction or guidance present,
5. the presence or absence of working examples,
6. the breadth of the claims,
7. the quantity of experimentation needed, and
8. the level of the skill in the art.

In the instant case,

The nature of the invention

Claims 38-40 are drawn to the treatment of depression which includes both curative and preventive treatment such as slowing, interrupting, arresting, controlling or stopping the progression of depression (see page 31 of the specification).

The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art

The state of the prior art is that the pharmacological art involves screening in vitro and in vivo to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities (i.e. what compounds can treat, curative or prophylactic, which specific diseases by what mechanism). There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face.

The instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable as discussed below: According to Morilak et al., the treatment of depression by noradrenergic modulatory function can alleviate many of the symptoms of stress-related illnesses such as depression (page 1222) and that it is important to continue to clarify the exact role played by this system in behavioral adaptation to stress and to better understand how

the regulation of this system by pharmacological or other therapeutic interventions may contribute to the successful alleviation of such disorders. Page 1221 discloses that dual uptake inhibitors as well as selective NE reuptake inhibitors are effective in alleviating depressed mood and other "inhibitory" symptoms of depression. The abstract states that a better understanding of the role of NE in adaptive responses to acute stress, the pathological consequences of prolonged, repeated or severe stress, and the mechanisms of action of drugs used to treat stress-related diseases, may contribute to the future development of more effective strategies for the treatment or even prevention of such disorders. This provides that the known role of NE is for the treatment of certain symptoms of depression and that more understanding and development is needed for more effective strategies for the treatment and possible prevention of depression.

It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art would recognize that in regards to therapeutic and preventive effects of diseases applicant considers associated with norepinephrine dysfunction, whether or not the disease is effected by the reuptake of norepinephrine would make a difference along with whether any of the compounds can inhibit this.

For example, the treatment of different types of depression differ in etiology, mechanisms, pathophysiology, symptomatology, diagnosis, therapy and physiological

Art Unit: 1626

responses.

It is the state of the art that there is no known cure or prevention for depression.

Hence, in the absence of a showing of correlation between depression claimed as capable of treatment (including prevention) by the inhibition of the reuptake of norepinephrine, one of skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from the administration of the compound of the claims due to the unpredictability of the role of the inhibition of the reuptake of norepinephrine.

The amount of direction or guidance present and the presence or absence of working examples

The only direction or guidance present in the instant specification is the listing of diseases applicant considers as treatable on 19-27 and in vitro assay data on pages 106-114. There are no working examples present for the treatment (including prophylactic treatment) of any disorder. There are no test(s) directed to or pointed out which are art-recognized for predicting in vivo efficacy for the treatment of depression.

The uses covered by the claims is not enabled based solely on the assay testing reported in the specification. Various studies reported for compounds in clinical development rely on animal models and not simply assay testing as done herein. Note Hoffman V. Klaus 9 USPQ2d 1657 regarding the standard of testing that is necessary to establish the likelihood of in vivo use. Also see Ex parte Powers 220 USPQ 925. Where the utility is unusual or difficult to treat or speculative, the examiner has authority to require evidence that tests relied on are reasonably predictive of in vivo efficacy by those skilled in the art. See for example, In re Ruskin 148 USPQ 221; Ex parte

Jovanovics 211 USPQ 907. Any evidence relied on by applicants must clearly show a reasonable expectation of in vivo success for any additional diseases that may still be embraced in response to this action. See MPEP 2164.05(a).

Further, receptor activity is generally unpredictable and a highly structure specific area.

Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved." See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

The breadth of the claims

The breadth of the claims are a method of treating (including both curative and prophylactic treatment) depression.

The quantity of experimentation needed

The quantity of experimentation needed is undue experimentation. One of skill in the art would need to determine what diseases out of all diseases would be benefited (treated) by inhibition of the reuptake of norepinephrine and would furthermore then have to determine which of the claimed compounds would provide treatment of which disease, if any.

The level of the skill in the art

While the level of skill in the art is high, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Thus, the specification fails to provide sufficient support of the use of the compound of the instant claims for the treatment of depression. As a result necessitating one of skill to perform an exhaustive search for which treatment method of depression can be accomplished by what compounds of the instant claims in order to practice the claimed invention.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instantly claimed methods. In view of the breadth of the claim, the chemical nature of the invention, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds in regards to the treatment or prevention of depression, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the invention commensurate with the claims.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CA FC) 42 USPQ2d 1001, states that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion" and "[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may

Art Unit: 1626

not be workable".

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors and *In re Fisher* (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test whether depression can be treated (both curative and prophylactic) by the compound encompassed in the instant claims, with no assurance of success.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Rebecca L. Anderson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0696. Mrs. Anderson can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 6:00am until 2:30pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mr. Joseph K. McKane, can be reached at (571) 272-0699.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Rebecca Anderson/
Primary Examiner, AU 1626

15 February 2008

Rebecca Anderson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1626, Group 1620
Technology Center 1600